DO	$\sim$

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

AROR ARK O'DIAH, 07A2463,

Plaintiff,

-V-

DECISION AND ORDER 10-CV-6611L

SECRETARY NYS DEPARTMENT TAXATION and FINANCE; SECRETARY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF STATE; NEW YORK STATE SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; THOMAS A. KLONICK; ROY L. REARDON; JAMES EDWARD PELZER; MANUEL A ROMERO; PATRICK T. BURKE; SHERRILL SPATZ; COMMISSIONERS and ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES OF THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES; PETRONE & PETRONE, P.C. and DAVIS H. WALSH, IV;

STATES DISTRICT OF STATES DISTRI

Defendants.

AROR ARK O'DIAH, 07A2463,

Plaintiff,

-V-

DECISION AND ORDER 11-CV-6128L

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and NEW YORK STATE,

Defendants.

## INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff pro se O'Diah previously filed motions to reconsider and vacate the decision to dismiss actions 10-CV-6611L and 11-CV-6128L. Those motions were denied (10-CV-6611L,

Docket # 13 and 11-CV-6128, Docket # 9). Plaintiff has filed what he has called "re-submissions of plaintiff's affidavit ...to vacate, reconsider ...May 6, 2011 judgments and ...show cause, order," (10-CV-6611L, Docket # 15 and 11-CV-6128L, Docket # 11). Plaintiff has largely re-copied his initial submissions, with a few additional assertions. Nothing in plaintiff's "re-submission" allows the Court to grant relief from the Court's previous Orders. Plaintiff does not demonstrate that there has been a mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, or newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time, nor does he show that his claim should be reopened in the interest of justice. Accordingly, plaintiff's motions for reconsideration is hereby denied..

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DAVID G. LARIMER United States District Judge

DATED: Rochester, New York